

REMARKS

Claim 1 is rejected as lacking support in the specification. Applicants have amended claim 1 to follow closely the description and terminology used in the specification.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, “fastening a member carrying said waste, replacement fluid, and blood withdrawal lines to a treatment machine; the member and treatment machine being configured such that by said step of connecting, said waste, withdrawal, and return lines are engaged by and actuated by said pump.” None of the references shows or suggests the recited method. The specification supports the added recitation at page 14, ll. 15-19, ll. 26-29, page 15, ll. 22-28 and Figs. 7 and 8. In Ash, the blood and dialysate pumps are widely separated and there is no means shown for achieving the recited step of engaging a single member ... such that by said step of engaging a member, said at least one pump is enabled to pump fluid through said waste, withdrawal and return lines.” As described in the specification, the recited feature provides lower complexity and convenience in setting up for treatment.

Claim 13 has been amended to more precisely correspond to the supporting description in the specification at page 17, l. 29 – page 18, l. 6. As the supporting discussion in the specification shows, the method of claim 13 has to do with responding without a pressure transducer. In the rejection of claim 13, the Office Action applied the reference, Kitaevich, stating that it showed measuring and responding to pressure. However, Kitaevich does not show what is recited in the claim, namely, responding to an indication of a difference in a flow indicated by pump speed and one indicated by a flow sensor. None of the other references suggests using the recited method.

Claim 16 has been amended to place it in independent form. The Office Action rejected claim 16 without providing a basis for the rejection or identifying the limitations added by it. None of the references disclose or suggest such a set of limitations.

The recitation added as new claims 17 and 18 is supported at page 17, l. 29 – page 18, l. 6.

In view of the above, the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner requires clarification of any issues raised in this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 778-1118.

Respectfully submitted,

PROSKAUER ROSE, LLP

Dated: August 12, 2004

By: 

Mark A. Catan, Esq.
Reg. No. 38,720

Proskauer Rose, LLP
1585 Broadway
New York, NY 10036-8299